

## Part 1: Campus Report Summary (ELCC 2.2 k-i, s-iv; 2.5 k-i, s-i, ii, iii, iv; 2.9 s-i, ii, iii, iv)

A critical skill for an instructional leader is the ability to use data-based decision making. You will practice this skill in this Application assignment as you collect data in preparation for creating an action plan for school improvement. In this section, you will select a school—ideally one in which you work—and review its AEIS data.

The comparisons below are based on the state accountability standards reported in the 2009 Accountability Manual and the information from the 2008-2009 AEIS report generated for South Houston Elementary.

### 2009 3<sup>rd</sup> Grade Reading Summary (English):

In this area, each of the following subgroups were rated as Exemplary: state, district, campus, Hispanic, male, female, economically disadvantaged, and limited English proficient. The campus group was rated as Recognized. Scores in each subgroup increased from 2008 to 2009.

The following groups were marked with an asterisk due to small numbers: African American, White, Native American, Asian/Pacific Islander, and special education.

Indicator:	Performance:	Rating:
State	90%	Exemplary
District	91%	Exemplary
Campus Group	89%	Recognized
Campus	94%	Exemplary
African American	*	
Hispanic	94%	Exemplary
White	*	
Native American	*	
Asian/Pacific Is	*	
Male	92%	Exemplary
Female	96%	Exemplary
Special Ed.	*	
Econ. Disad.	93%	Exemplary
LEP	96%	Exemplary

### 2009 3<sup>rd</sup> Grade Reading Summary (Spanish):

In this area, the following groups were rated as Exemplary: campus, Hispanic, male, female, economically disadvantaged, and LEP. State, district, and campus group indicators were rated as Recognized. A majority of the scores increased from the 2008 to the 2009 school year. Scores for the district and female subgroups remained the same.

The following groups were marked with an asterisk due to small numbers: African American, White, Native American, Asian/Pacific Islander, and special education.

Indicator:	Performance:	Rating:
State	84%	Recognized
District	89%	Recognized
Campus Group	89%	Recognized
Campus	>99%	Exemplary
African American	*	
Hispanic	>99%	Exemplary
White	*	
Native American	*	
Asian/Pacific Is	*	
Male	>99%	Exemplary
Female	>99%	Exemplary
Special Ed.	*	
Econ. Disad.	>99%	Exemplary
LEP	>99%	Exemplary

### 2009 3<sup>rd</sup> Grade Math Summary (English):

In this area, the following groups were rated as Exemplary: campus, Hispanic, male, female, economically disadvantaged, and LEP. State, district, and campus group indicators were rated as Recognized. Scores increased from 2008 to 2009 for the following groups: state, campus, Hispanic, male, female, economically disadvantaged, and LEP. Scores for the district and campus group decreased from 2008 to 2009.

The following groups were marked with an asterisk due to small numbers: African American, White, Native American, Asian/Pacific Islander, and special education.

Indicator:	Performance:	Rating:
State	86%	Recognized
District	86%	Recognized
Campus Group	83%	Recognized
Campus	96%	Exemplary
African American	*	
Hispanic	96%	Exemplary
White	*	
Native American	*	
Asian/Pacific Is	*	
Male	96%	Exemplary
Female	96%	Exemplary
Special Ed.	*	
Econ. Disad.	95%	Exemplary
LEP	>99%	Exemplary

### 2009 3<sup>rd</sup> Grade Math Summary (Spanish):

In this area, the state is rated as acceptable. The district, campus group, and female subgroup are rated as Recognized. The following groups are rated as Exemplary: campus, Hispanic, male, economically disadvantaged, and LEP. Scores for all of the subgroups counted increased from 2008 to 2009 with the exception of the district.

The following groups were marked with an asterisk due to small numbers: African American, White, Native American, Asian/Pacific Islander, and special education.

Indicator:	Performance:	Rating:
State	79%	Acceptable
District	84%	Recognized
Campus Group	87%	Recognized
Campus	95%	Exemplary
African American	*	
Hispanic	95%	Exemplary
White	*	
Native American	*	
Asian/Pacific Is	*	
Male	>99%	Exemplary
Female	83%	Recognized
Special Ed.	*	
Econ. Disad.	95%	Exemplary
LEP	95%	Exemplary

### 2009 4<sup>th</sup> Grade Reading Summary (English):

In this area, the following groups were rated as Exemplary: campus, Hispanic, female, and economically disadvantaged. The state, district, campus group, male, and LEP groups were rated as Recognized. The scores for each group increased from 2008 to 2009, with significant increases in the female, economically disadvantaged, and LEP groups.

The following groups were marked with an asterisk due to small numbers: African American, White, Native American, Asian/Pacific Islander, and special education.

Indicator:	Performance:	Rating:
State	86%	Recognized
District	84%	Recognized
Campus Group	83%	Recognized
Campus	92%	Exemplary
African American	*	
Hispanic	91%	Exemplary
White	*	
Native American	*	
Asian/Pacific Is	*	
Male	86%	Recognized
Female	95%	Exemplary
Special Ed.	*	
Econ. Disad.	91%	Exemplary
LEP	84%	Recognized

#### 2009 4<sup>th</sup> Grade Reading Summary (Spanish):

In this area, only the campus group and the economically disadvantaged subgroup were rated as Exemplary. The following groups were rated as Recognized: state, district, campus, Hispanic, male, female, and LEP. There were major increases from 2008 to 2009. The following groups raised scores in 2008 from the 40's to the 80's: campus, Hispanic, male, and LEP. The economically disadvantaged subgroup increased from 42% in 2008 to 91% in 2009.

The following groups were marked with an asterisk due to small numbers: African American, White, Native American, Asian/Pacific Islander, and special education.

Indicator:	Performance:	Rating:
State	81%	Recognized
District	80%	Recognized
Campus Group	96%	Exemplary
Campus	83%	Recognized
African American	*	
Hispanic	83%	Recognized
White	*	
Native American	*	
Asian/Pacific Is	*	
Male	86%	Recognized
Female	80%	Recognized
Special Ed.	*	
Econ. Disad.	91%	Exemplary
LEP	83%	Recognized

#### 2009 4<sup>th</sup> Grade Math Summary (English):

In this area, the state, district, and campus group are rated as Recognized. The campus, Hispanic, male, female, economically disadvantaged, and LEP subgroups were rated as Exemplary. There were increases in scores across the board from 2008 to 2009.

The following groups were marked with an asterisk due to small numbers: African American, White, Native American, Asian/Pacific Islander, and special education.

Indicator:	Performance:	Rating:
State	88%	Recognized
District	86%	Recognized
Campus Group	89%	Recognized
Campus	98%	Exemplary
African American	*	
Hispanic	98%	Exemplary
White	*	
Native American	*	
Asian/Pacific Is	*	
Male	>99%	Exemplary
Female	97%	Exemplary
Special Ed.	*	
Econ. Disad.	>99%	Exemplary
LEP	>99%	Exemplary

#### 2009 4<sup>th</sup> Grade Math Summary (Spanish):

This area appears to be the weakest area for my campus. We fell below state, district, and campus group levels. The campus group was rated as Exemplary and the state and district were rated as Recognized. The district, campus, Hispanic, male, female, economically disadvantaged, and LEP subgroups were all rated as Acceptable. Scores increased from 2008 to 2009 for the state and campus group. Scores for all of the other groups counted decreased from 2008 to 2009.

The following groups were marked with an asterisk due to small numbers: African American, White, Native American, Asian/Pacific Islander, and special education.

Indicator:	Performance:	Rating:
State	80%	Recognized
District	76%	Recognized
Campus Group	92%	Exemplary
Campus	67%	Acceptable
African American	*	
Hispanic	67%	Acceptable
White	*	
Native American	*	
Asian/Pacific Is	*	
Male	71%	Acceptable
Female	60%	Acceptable
Special Ed.	*	
Econ. Disad.	73%	Acceptable
LEP	67%	Acceptable

#### 2009 4<sup>th</sup> Grade Writing Summary (English):

In this area, all of the groups scored in the Exemplary range. All of the groups with the exception of the state increased their scores from 2008 to 2009.

The following groups were marked with an asterisk due to small numbers: African American, White, Native American, Asian/Pacific Islander, and special education.

Indicator:	Performance:	Rating:
State	92%	Exemplary
District	94%	Exemplary
Campus Group	93%	Exemplary
Campus	>99%	Exemplary
African American	*	
Hispanic	>99%	Exemplary
White	*	
Native American	*	
Asian/Pacific Is	*	
Male	>99%	Exemplary
Female	>99%	Exemplary
Special Ed.	*	
Econ. Disad.	>99%	Exemplary
LEP	>99%	Exemplary

#### 2009 4<sup>th</sup> Grade Writing Summary (Spanish):

All of the groups scored in the Exemplary range. The state, district, and campus group indicators increased their scores from 2008 to 2009. The following groups remained the same from 2008 to 2009: campus, Hispanic, male, economically disadvantaged, and LEP. The female group was marked with an asterisk in 2008 due to small numbers.

The following groups were marked with an asterisk due to small numbers: African American, White, Native American, Asian/Pacific Islander, and special education.

Indicator:	Performance:	Rating:
State	93%	Exemplary
District	97%	Exemplary
Campus Group	>99%	Exemplary
Campus	>99%	Exemplary
African American	*	
Hispanic	>99%	Exemplary
White	*	
Native American	*	
Asian/Pacific Is	*	
Male	>99%	Exemplary
Female	>99%	Exemplary
Special Ed.	*	
Econ. Disad.	>99%	Exemplary
LEP	>99%	Exemplary

## **Part 2: Campus Group and CI Report Summary (ELCC 2.2 k-i, s-iv; 2.5 k-i, s-i, ii, iii, iv; 2.9 s-i, ii, iii, iv)**

Prior to completing this part of the assignment, review “Appendix F – Campus Comparison Group” in the Week 2 Reading *2009 Accountability Manual*.

### **Campus Group and CI Report Summary Workspace**

The campus group for South Houston Elementary includes 40 other elementary schools that have similar demographics including percentage of Hispanic students, percentage of economically disadvantaged students, percentage of limited English proficient (LEP) students, percentage of mobile students, percentage of White students, and percentage of African American Students. The schools in South Houston’s campus group have an average of 97.4% Hispanic (96.5%-98.0%), 90.3% economically disadvantaged (83.5%-99.7%), 42.2% LEP (17.3%-68.1%), 17.3% mobility (9.7%-25.3), 1.8% White (1.2%-2.9%), and 0.4% African American (0.0%-1.2%). The campus group described above can be used to compare the performance of South Houston Elementary with other demographically similar schools. The campus group information is also used to determine Comparable Improvement. Comparable Improvement is calculated by finding the average Texas Growth Index (TGI) in a school and comparing it to the other schools in the campus group. Following is a summary of the Comparable Improvement for South Houston Elementary:

South Houston was in Q2 (top 50%) for both Reading/ELA and Mathematics. In the area of Reading/ELA, South Houston’s 2009 average scaled score was lower than the 2008 scale score but higher than the 2009 estimated scaled score. Because the actual score in 2009 was higher than the projected score, TGI was a positive 0.16 (which is even better than the group average of 0.14). This positive TGI indicates that students at South Houston Elementary have made Comparable Improvement in the area of Reading/ELA. In the area of Mathematics, South Houston Elementary improved its average scale score from 2008 to 2009. The 2009 average scale score was also higher than the estimated average scale score. The average TGI in math was 0.31, which indicates that students at South Houston made improvement in the area of math. The TGI for math (0.31) was well above the group average TGI of 0.17

**Part 3: Multi-Year History Report Summary** (ELCC 2.2 k-i, s-iv; 2.5 k-i, s-i, ii, iii, iv; 2.9 s-i, ii, iii, iv)

**Multi-Year History Report Summary Workspace**

The data reported for All Tests Taken shows consistent improvement in scores for all students, Hispanic students, and economically disadvantaged students over time from 2003 to 2009. Scores for White students are only reported for 2006 and 2007. The scores for that group remained the same at >99%.

On the TAKS reading/ELA test, all students, Hispanic students, and economically disadvantaged students showed consistent improvement in performance with the exception of the 2008 scores. All students and economically disadvantaged student scores decreased in 2008 and then increased again in 2009 to indicate performance even better than all the previous years. Hispanic students scores remained the same from 2007 to 2008 at 88%. Score for White students remained the same from 2006 to 2007 at >99%.

On the TAKS Mathematics section, all students, Hispanic students White students, and economically disadvantaged students showed consistent improvement in test scores from 2003 to 2006. Scores for all students, Hispanic students, and White students remained the same in 2007 and then began to increase again in 2008 and 2009. Scores for the economically disadvantaged students decreased from 2006 to 2007 and then began to increase again in 2008 and 2009.

On the TAKS Writing test, all students, Hispanic students and economically disadvantaged students scores increased from 2003 to 2006, decreased in 2007, and then increased again in 2008 and 2009. White students were not counted in this data because of low numbers.

African American student scores are not reported on the AEIS Campus Data history chart because of low number of African American students enrolled at South Houston Elementary.

It was observed when studying the data, that scores either decreased or remained the same from 2006 to 2007 in math and writing, but scores in reading improved during that time. Scores in math and writing increased from 2007 to 2008, but scores in reading decreased during that time.

It is important to note that every time score decreased or remained that same for one year, they improved the next year to be better than any of the previous scores.

Campus changes between 2003 and 2009 exceeded state and district changes during that same period of time in all counted subgroups on the Reading/ELA and Mathematics tests as well as both tests combined (All Tests Taken).

**Part 4: AEIS Comparison Chart – All Grades Tested (ELCC 2.5 k-i, s-i, ii, iii, iv; 2.9 s-i, ii, iii, iv)**

In the next section of the assignment, complete three charts using AEIS data: one for your selected campus; a second for a selected grade level; and a third for other campus factors.

## AEIS Comparison Chart: All Grades Tested

	Acceptable	Recognized	Exemplary
Base Indicators	<b>Standard (varies by subject):</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reading: 70%</li> <li>Writing: 70%</li> <li>Social Studies: 70%</li> <li>Mathematics: 60%</li> <li>Science: 55 %</li> </ul>	Standard (same for all subjects): 80%	Standard (same for all subjects): 90%
TAKS (use most recent results & most recent standards criteria)	<b>Standard – Campus Score = Difference</b> <i>Example: 70 – 65 = -5</i>	<b>Standard – Campus Score = Difference</b> <i>Example: 75 – 65 = -10</i>	<b>Standard – Campus Score = Difference</b> <i>Example: 90 – 65 = -25</i>
<b>Reading/ ELA</b>	70%	80%	90%
All Students	94-70= +24	94-80= +14	94-90= +4
African American	*	*	*
Hispanic	93-70= +23	93-80= +13	93-90= +3
White	*	*	*
Econ. Disadvantaged	94-70= +24	94-80= +14	94-90= +4
<b>Writing</b>	70%	80%	90%
All Students	>99-70= +>29	>99-80= +>19	>99-90= +>9
African American	*	*	*
Hispanic	>99-70= +>29	>99-80= +>19	>99-90= +>9
White	*	*	*
Econ. Disadvantaged	>99-70= +>29	>99-80= +>19	>99-90= +>9



**AEIS Comparison Chart: All Grades Tested (Continued)**

<b>Social Studies</b>	Not administered in my school.	Not administered in my school.	Not administered in my school.
All Students			
African American			
Hispanic			
White			
Econ. Disadvantaged			
<b>Mathematics</b>	60%	80%	90%
All Students	94-60= +34	94-80= +14	94-90= +4
African American	*	*	*
Hispanic	94-60= +34	94-80= +14	94-90= +4
White	*	*	*
Econ. Disadvantaged	95-60= +35	95-80= +15	95-90= +5
<b>Science</b>	Not administered in my school.	Not administered in my school.	Not administered in my school.
All Students			
African American			
Hispanic			
White			
Econ. Disadvantaged			

## AEIS Comparison Chart: Grade Level

For this portion of the assignment, select a grade level at your campus.

	Acceptable	Recognized	Exemplary
<b>Base Indicators</b>	<b>Standard (varies by subject):</b> <b>Reading: 70%</b> <b>Writing: 70%</b> <b>Social Studies: 70%</b> <b>Mathematics: 60%</b> <b>Science: 55%</b>	<b>Standard (same for all subjects): 80%</b>	<b>Standard (same for all subjects): 90%</b>
<b>TAKS (use most current AEIS data &amp; standards)</b>	<b>Standard – Grade Level = Difference</b>	<b>Standard – Grade Level = Difference</b>	<b>Standard – Grade Level = Difference</b>
<b>Reading/ ELA (English)</b>	70%	80%	90%
All Students	92-70= +22	92-80= +12	92-90= +2
African American	*	*	*
Hispanic	91-70= +21	91-80= +11	91-90= +1
White	*	*	*
Econ. Disadvantaged	91-70= +21	91-80= +11	91-90= +1
<b>Writing (English)</b>	70%	80%	90%
All Students	>99-70= +>29	>99-80= +>19	>99-90= +>9
African American	*	*	*
Hispanic	>99-70= +>29	>99-80= +>19	>99-90= +>9
White	*	*	*
Econ. Disadvantaged	>99-70= +>29	>99-80= +>19	>99-90= +>9

### AEIS Comparison Chart: Grade Level (Continued)

<b>Social Studies</b>	Not administered in my school.	Not administered in my school.	Not administered in my school.
All Students			
African American			
Hispanic			
White			
Econ. Disadvantaged			
<b>Mathematics (Spanish)</b>	60%	80%	90%
All Students	67-60= +7	67-80= -13	67-90= -23
African American	*	*	*
Hispanic	67-60= +7	67-80= -13	67-90= -23
White	*	*	*
Econ. Disadvantaged	73-60= +13	73-80= -7	73-90= -17
<b>Science</b>	Not administered in my school.	Not administered in my school.	Not administered in my school.
All Students			
African American			
Hispanic			
White			
Econ. Disadvantaged			

## AEIS Comparison Chart: Other Factors

	Acceptable	Recognized	Exemplary
<b>Base Indicators</b>	<b>Standard:</b>	<b>Standard:</b>	<b>Standard:</b>
<b>TAKS (use most current AEIS data &amp; standards)</b>	<b>Standard – Campus Score = difference</b>	<b>Standard – Campus Score = difference</b>	<b>Standard – Campus Score = difference</b>
<b>Completion Rate (High School)</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A
All Students			
African American			
Hispanic			
White			
Econ. Disadvantaged			
<b>Base Indicators</b>	<b>Standard:</b>	<b>Standard:</b>	<b>Standard:</b>
<b>TAKS (use most current AEIS data &amp; standards)</b>	<b>Standard – Campus Score = difference</b>	<b>Standard – Campus Score = difference</b>	<b>Standard – Campus Score = difference</b>
<b>Dropout Rate (Grades 7 &amp; 8)</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A
All Students			
African American			
Hispanic			
White			
Econ. Disadvantaged			
<b>Base Indicators</b>	<b>Standard: 90%</b>	<b>Standard: 95%</b>	<b>Standard: 97%</b>
<b>TAKS (AEIS reports the previous year's attendance rate)</b>	<b>Standard – Campus Score = difference</b>	<b>Standard – Campus Score = difference</b>	<b>Standard – Campus Score = difference</b>
<b>Attendance Rate</b>	96.6-90= +6.6	96.6- 95= +1.6	96.6-97= -0.4

**Part 5: Area of Strength (ELCC 2.2. k-i, s-i, iv; 2.5 k-i, s-i, ii, iii, iv; 2.9 k-i, s-i, ii, iii)**

In part 4, you completed the AEIS Comparison Charts to record your school's scores and compare them to the standards for each AEIS rating by computing the difference between the standard for Acceptable, Recognized, and Exemplary in each subject, grade, and subgroup. Next, you will use the data to determine areas of strength and weakness at the campus. In a later assignment, you will use the data to build an action plan for school improvement.

Identified Area of Strength	Why I Chose It
1. TAKS Writing	I chose this area because the students at my school are exceeding the exemplary standard in writing by more than 9 points. Not only did all of our students combined exceed the standard by more than 9 points, the subgroups Hispanic and economically disadvantaged students did as well. Scores were not reported for African American and White students.

Identified Areas of Weakness	Why I Chose It
1. Fourth grade reading in English and Spanish.	I chose this area because as a whole, the students are exceeding the exemplary standard by only two points. The Hispanic and economically disadvantaged subgroups are only exceeding the exemplary standard by one point. When compared to other areas such as writing, the students should be doing much better. This area of weakness is something that can be discussed in vertical teams to brainstorm ideas on how to strengthen the students reading skills.
2. Fourth grade math in Spanish.	When compared to the math scores of the students who took the test in English, this area is very low. In English, fourth grade scores were 98%. In Spanish, they were at 67%. It is clear, based on the data, that this area must be addressed further. Scores improved from the previous year, but they are not commensurate with those of the English-speaking students. Students earned comparable scores on the Spanish and English TAKS in reading and writing. The same should be expected and earned for math.